Remarks/Arguments

Claims 1-4 are in the application. The Examiner has required restriction of the claimed invention to either: Claims 1-3 drawn to a nutritional composition; or, Claim 4 drawn to a process for eradicating pathogenic organisms.

Applicants elect Claims 1-3 with traverse for reasons provided below.

Claim 4 includes all the limitations of Claim 1, and thus is very closely related to claims 1-3. To require a second patent application, and resulting patent, for this closely related subject matter would result in a burden on the PTO, the Applicants and the public. The PTO would be burdened by having to handle an additional patent application file and to assign an examiner to do a separate search and examination. This would only add to the current backlog of cases in the PTO. Applicants would be burdened by having to pay additional fees and expend efforts in prosecuting the additional application, instead of using their time to pursue the useful arts. The public would be burdened by having to consider two patents instead of one in any infringement or freedom to operate analysis.

In contrast, should all four claims be considered in one application the additional burden on the examiner would be minimal.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants request withdrawal of the requirement for restriction.

Joseph M. Mazzarese
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. **32,803**

Wyeth
Patent Law Department
Five Giralda Farms
Madison, NJ 07940
Tel. No. (973) 660-**7657**